

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/028,060	12/21/2001	Kimberly Ann Newell	M233.101.101	2940
25281	7590 05/17/2005		EXAMINER	
DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, P.L.L.C.			LUU, SY D	
FIFTH STREET TOWERS 100 SOUTH FIFTH STREET, SUITE 2250		2250	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MINNEAPO	LIS, MN 55402		2174	
			DATE MAILED: 05/17/2009	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

}	Application No.	Applicant(s)	<del></del>			
Office Action Summary	10/028,060	NEWELL ET AL.				
	Examiner	Art Unit				
The MAILING DATE of this communication	Sy D Luu	2174	ldress			
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, reply within the statutory minimum od will apply and will expire SIX (6 tute, cause the application to because	nay a reply be timely filed of thirty (30) days will be considered timel NONTHS from the mailing date of this come ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28	February 2005.					
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ T	2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This action is non-final.					
	,					
closed in accordance with the practice unde	er <i>Ex par</i> te Quayle, 1935	5 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-83</u> is/are pending in the applicati	on.		•			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-83</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	d/an alaatian waxaa		•			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>01 April 2002</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	gn priority under 35 U.S	S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority docume		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Otana			
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		view Summary (PTO-413) er No(s)/Mail Date				
<ul> <li>2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/</li> </ul>		ce of Informal Patent Application (PTC	O-152)			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date		r:	-			
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04) Office	Action Summary	Part of Paper No./Mail D	ate 05102005			

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This communication is responsive to the Response filed February 28, 2005.

2. The Examiner acknowledges that the CA District Court Manual is not prior art under 35

U.S.C. § 103(a). The previous rejections of claims 1-83 under U.S.C. § 103(a) are withdrawn

accordingly. New grounds of rejections over Grow (US 6,694,315 B1) are set forth below.

3. Claims 1-83 are pending in this application. This action is made Non-Final.

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found

in a prior Office action.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. Claims 1-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grow (US 6,694,315 B1).

As per claim 1, Grow teaches a computer-based user interface for accessing litigation information associated with at least one litigation case, the user interface comprising: a website for managing litigation information, wherein the website provides querying and updating docket information (col. 2, lines 4-35). Grow does not explicitly disclose the details of the website to comprise of a home page including a first plurality of user-selectable hyperlinks, each hyperlink in the first plurality of hyperlinks identifying a category of litigation information, and a plurality of web pages, each web page associated with one of the hyperlinks in the first plurality of hyperlinks, each web page providing litigation information related to the category identified by the hyperlink associated with the web page, each web page displayed in response to selection of

Application/Control Number: 10/028,060

Art Unit: 2174

the hyperlink associated with the web page. However, all of these detail setups and access organization of information for a website are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include these features with Grow's teaching in order to provide a user with means for quickly navigating through web pages to arrive at the desired litigation information for browsing, and/or for updating.

As per claims 2-34, 36 and 43, Grow teaches/suggests categories to be various types of information such as contact information, docket information, correspondence information (col. 5, lines 4-14); pleadings information, discovery information, trial information (col. 12, lines 20); motion information (col. 6, line 21), rules (col. 9, lines 63-65), expert (col. 9, lines 5-6), court orders (col. 12, line 27), client (col. 17, line 21); search feature (col. 3, lines 14-15) and obtaining/downloading electronic copies (col. 6, lines 56-58). Grow does not expressly disclose patent, copy, and status information, as well as detail description of all the information, and the downloading of electronic copies being done via hyperlinks. However, these types of information and features are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine/include these information/features with the teaching of Grow in order to provide all pertinent information as required in a litigation management system.

As per claims 35, 38-42, 44-48, all claim limitations such as various configuration of client/server computers and data storage methods on a networks, presenting to users all main menu options/hyperlinks at all times, and launching application programs from a web page using hyperlinks are well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine/include these features with the teaching of Grow in order to

Application/Control Number: 10/028,060

Art Unit: 2174

facilitate users' navigation of web pages, as well as to manage, share and distribute litigation information efficiently and effectively.

Claim 49 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 17 and 40, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 50-51 are similar in scope to the combination of claims 7, 14, 21, 27, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 52-53 are similar in scope to the combination of claims 2-3, 5, 7, 10, 14, 18, 21, 24, 27-28, and 11 are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 54-58 are similar in scope to claims 33-36 and 38 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 59-61 are similar in scope to claims 46-48 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 62 is similar in scope to claim 49, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 63-66 are similar in scope to claims 52, 56-58, respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 68-69 are similar in scope to claims 42 and 44, respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale. Although Grow does not expressly indicate data storage to be on the client computer, however, the choice of storing data information in either the server or client in a network environment is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to select either storage destination as a preference depending on the implementation method.

Application/Control Number: 10/028,060

Art Unit: 2174

Claims 70-74 are similar in scope to claims 62, 65, 50-52, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 75 is similar in scope to claims 49, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale. CA District Court further discloses a client login page (page 11, top figure).

As per claim 76, Grow does not expressly disclose the user interface information to further comprise: a plurality of topics pages, each topics page associated with a particular client and including a plurality of hyperlinks identifying a plurality of topics, the plurality of hyperlinks identifying a plurality of topics including a litigation hyperlink; and wherein each litigation case selection page is associated with a litigation hyperlink on one of the plurality of topics pages. However, all of these detail setups and access organization of information for a website are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include these features with Grow's teaching in order to provide a user with means for efficiently navigating through web pages to arrive at the desired litigation information for browsing.

As per claims 77-79, all claim limitations regarding the use of inactive hyperlinks, links to client's competitors as well as client's intellectual property applications are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include these features with the teaching of Grow in order to facilitate users navigation of web pages, as well as to provide users with means to quickly access pertinent and critical litigation information.

Claim 81 is similar in scope to claims 50 and 52, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim582-83 are similar in scope to claim 65, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Application/Control Number: 10/028,060 Page 6

Art Unit: 2174

## Inquires

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sy Luu whose telephone number is (571) 272-4064. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 7:00 am to 4:30 pm (EST). The examiner can also be reached on alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (571) 272-4063.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

SY D. LUU

PRIMARY EXAMINER